



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,710	12/03/2003	William Samuel Herz	NVID-077/00US 140060-2154	6902
23419 7590 12/26/2008 COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP ATTN: Patent Group Suite 1100 777 - 6th Street, NW Washington, DC 20001				
EXAMINER				
ZHAO, DAQUAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/26/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,710

Applicant(s)

HERZ, WILLIAM SAMUEL

Examiner

DAQUAN ZHAO

Art Unit

2621

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 19, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 19, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 19, 22 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3-9, 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sturgeon et al (US 6,064,385), hereinafter referenced as Sturgeon.

For claim 1, Sturgeon teach an apparatus to process an audio/video program, comprising:

a preferences module configured to
coordinate specification, by a first user, of a first set of presentation settings with
a first set of portions of said audio/video program and with said first user, and
coordinate specification, by a second user, of a second set of presentation
settings with a second set of portions of said audio/video program and with said second
user (e.g. abstract, column 4, lines 20-31, the examiner considers that the "current user
preference value" and the "new preference value" can be set by the first user and the
second user, respectively. It is an inherent feature that the system of Sturgeon can be
used by different users to change the set up value during playback); and

a presentation module coupled to said preferences module, said presentation module being configured to,

during subsequent playback of said audio/video program for said first user, selectively apply said first set of presentation settings to said first set of portions of said audio/video program, and selectively apply said second presentation setting to said second portion of said audio/video program (e.g. column 4, lines 31-41).

during subsequent playback of said audio/video program for said second user, selectively apply said second set of presentation settings to said second set of portions of said audio/video program (e.g. column 4, lines 31-41).

For claim 19, Sturgeon teach a method of processing an audio/video program, comprising:

coordinating a first user-specified display setting with a first portion of said audio/video program (e.g. abstract, column 4, lines 20-31, the examiner considers that the "current user preference value" and the "new preference value" can be set by the first user and the second user, respectively. It is an inherent feature that the system of Sturgeon can be used by different users to change the set up value during playback);

coordinating a second user-specified setting with a second portion of said audio/video program, said first user-specified display setting and said second user-specified display setting corresponding to different ones of a letterbox setting, a non-square zoom setting, a pan and scan setting, and a pillar-box setting (e.g. column 8, lines 51-65);

determining an intermediate display setting based on said first user-specified display setting and said second user-specified display setting;

coordinating said intermediate display setting with an intermediate portion of said audio/video program, said intermediate portion of said audio/video program being positioned between said first portion of said audio/video program and said second portion of said audio/video program (e.g. It is an inherent feature that the system of Sturgeon can be used by three different users to change the set up value during playback. For example, a current user sets up the "current user preference value", a new user sets up the "new preference value", and then another new user sets up a "another new preference value", during playback. The portion of the video corresponds to the "new preference value" is the intermediate portion of the video corresponds to the "current user preference value" and the "another new preference value"); and

coordinating playback of said audio/video program based on said first user-specified display setting, said intermediate display setting, and second user-specified display setting (e.g. column 4, lines 31-41).

Claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 19 above

For claim 3, Sturgeon teach at least one of said first set of presentation setting and said second set of presentation settings corresponds to one of an audio setting and a display setting (e.g. column 8, lines 51-65).

For claim 4, Sturgeon teach said audio setting corresponds to one of an audio channel setting, an audio field setting, an audio format setting, a dynamic range setting,

a language setting, a pitch setting, a playback speed setting, a tone setting, and a volume setting (e.g. column 4, lines 31-41).

For claim 5, Sturgeon teach said display setting corresponds to one of a brightness setting, a black and white setting, a contrast setting, a color setting, a fast motion setting, a flicker setting, a gamma setting, a hue setting, a letter box setting, a non-square zoom setting, a pan and scan setting, a pillar-box setting, a pixel blurring setting, a pixel sharpening setting, a red-eye setting, a slow motion setting, and a zoom setting (e.g. column 4, lines 31-41).

For claim 6, Sturgeon teach preference module is configured to coordinate storage of said first set of presentation settings for said first user, and said preferences module is configured to coordinate storage of said second set of presentation settings for said second user (e.g. column 4, lines 20-31).

For claim 7, Sturgeon teach a memory coupled to said preferences modules and said presentation module, said memory being configured to store said first set of presentation setting for said first user and said second set of presentation setting for said second user (e.g. column 7, lines 25-40).

For claim 8, Sturgeon teach coordinate said specification of said first set of presentation settings with said first set of portions of said audio/video program based on input by said first user during initial playback of said audio/video program e.g. abstract, column 4, lines 20-31).

For claim 9, Sturgeon teach coordinate said specification of said first set of presentation settings with said second set of portions of said audio/video program

based on input by said second user during initial playback of said audio/video program e.g. abstract, column 4, lines 20-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturgeon as applied to claims 1, 3-9, 19 and 22 above, and further in view of Durden et al (US 2004/ 0,261,099 A1).

For claim 2, Sturgeon fail to teach a time stamp. Durden et al teach a time stamp (paragraph [0072]). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Durden et al into the teaching of Sturgeon for user to easily modify the video.

6. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturgeon as applied to claims 1, 3-9, 19 and 22 above, and further in view of Kruihara et al (US 5,754,243).

For claim 23, Sturgeon fails to teach interpolating display setting. Kruihara et al teach a letter-box interpolation method, which is considered to be interpolating display setting, column 2, lines 37-45. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to perform interpolation on two different display setting to reduce the roundness to the left and right portion of the display images (Kruihara et al, column1, lines 54-57).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Chen et al (US 7,391,963 B2).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daquan Zhao whose telephone number is (571) 270-1119. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fri. 7:30 -5, alt Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Thai Q, can be reached on (571)272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Daquan Zhao

/Thai Tran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621